SDC 1. Summary of RCTs Evaluating DRT

Study	Patients	Treatments	Outcomes
Burns			
Heimbach 1988[12]	Children/adults with life-threatening burns not expected to heal within 3 weeks (N = 106)	DRT versus SOC covering	DRT improved outcomes vs SOC: • ↓ donor site thickness (p <0.001) • Faster healing donor site (p <0.001) SOC associated with ↑ take (p <0.0001)
Branski 2007[20]	Pediatric; burn size ≥50% TBSA; ≥40% TBSA full-thickness burn (N = 20)	DRT versus autograft/allograft SG	DRT improved short-term outcomes vs SG: • ↓ resting energy expenditure (p <0.01) • ↑ serum constitutive proteins (p <0.03) DRT improved long-term outcomes vs SG: • ↑ bone mineral content/density (p <0.05) • Improved scarring (p <0.01)
Lagus 2013[65]	Adults, TBSA >20%; third-degree burns requiring fascial excision (N = 10)	DRT versus cellulose sponge versus STSG (all 3 treatments were applied to each	Similar outcomes in terms of take rate, histological, cosmesis and functional outcomes

Study	Patients	Treatments	Outcomes
		patient in 3 adjacent areas)	
Vana 2020[16]	Age 13-65 years with limited mobility due to sequelae of deep partial or full-thickness burns; Vancouver Scar Scale >6 (N = 24)	DRT versus single-layer dermal	Similar outcomes for: • Matrix take rate DRT improved outcomes vs single layer for: • Retraction rate • Skin quality • Mobility recovery
Limb Salvage			
Driver 2015[24]	Age ≥18 years; full-thickness DFU 1-12 cm^2 post-debridement (N = 307)	DRT versus SOC	DRT improved outcomes vs SOC: • ↑ complete ulcer closure rate (p = 0.001) • ↓ time to ulcer closure (p = 0.001) • ↑ rate of reduction of wound size (p = 0.012) • Improved quality of life SF-36 scores: ○ ↑ Physical functioning (p = 0.047) ○ ↓ Bodily pain (p = 0.033)
Trauma			

Study	Patients	Treatments	Outcomes
De Angelis 2018[33]	Post-traumatic wound on inferior limbs without tendon or bone exposure (N = 30)	DRT versus BLM	No difference between groups for: • Healing time; pain-related VAS scores; patient self-estimation at complete healing; short-term scar score; re-epithelialization BLM significantly improved total scar score vs DRT at 3 years (p = 0.001)
Miscellaneous			
Jeschke 2004[32]	Trauma, decollement, neoplasm, burn, wound healing delay (N = 12)	DRT plus fibrin glue and NPWT versus DRT	DRT in combination with fibrin glue and NPWT improved outcomes vs conventional DRT: • ↑ take rate (p <0.003) • ↓ time to skin transplantation (p <0.002)

DFU = diabetic foot ulcer; DRT = Dermal Regeneration Template; BLM = Bi-Layer Matrix; NPWT = negative-pressure wound therapy; RCT = randomized control trial; SF-36 = 36-item Short Form Survey; SG = skin graft; SOC = standard of care; STSG = split thickness skin graft; TBSA = total body surface area; VAS = Visual Analog Scale.